



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/500,639	02/09/2000	Chun-Ming Lu	6978.0097	2896
23838	7590 04/01/2004	EXAMINER		INER
KENYON & KENYON			SCHLAIFER, JONATHAN D	
1500 K STREET, N.W., SUITE 700 WASHINGTON, DC 20005		•	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	,		2178	12
			DATE MAILED: 04/01/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Advisory Action	09/500,639	LU ET AL.			
·	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Jonathan D. Schlaifer	2178			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	orrespondence address			
THE REPLY FILED FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	 a timely filed amendment whi 	cation. A proper reply to a ch places the application in			
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]				
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advevent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dath have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extens 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three moderned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	isory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE te on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.5 sion and the corresponding amount of the statutory period for reply originally set in	f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 136(a) and the appropriate extension fee fee. The appropriate extension fee under the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in			
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF					
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered b	ecause:				
(a) they raise new issues that would require furth	er consideration and/or search	(see NOTE below);			
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note I	pelow);				
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by ma	erially reducing or simplifying th			
(d) they present additional claims without cancel	ling a corresponding number of	finally rejected claims.			
NOTE:					
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	ction(s):				
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a s	separate, timely filed amendment			
5.⊠ The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for application in condition for allowance because: Se		sidered but does NOT place the			
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.				
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendmen explanation of how the new or amended claims w					
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:					
Claim(s) allowed:					
Claim(s) objected to:					
Claim(s) rejected:					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:					
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app	proved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.			
	Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)				
10. Other:		Oby Mong			

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 11-03) PRIMARY EXAMINER

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues that Graber does not teach replacing the domain name of the first web address with a forwarding URL without changing the URI. The examiner respectfully notes that Graber, Figure 6, items 660 and 670 disclose appending an identifier to a URL. (See also Graber, Col. 12, lines 43-58) Therefore, the original URL and the URL with said identification results in a final combined address.

Regarding Applicant's Interview Summary (Paper #9), Examiner respectfully notes that he does not agree with applicant's allegation that he agreed to call applicant before issuing an Advisory Action. Instead, Examiner indicated that he would call the applicant if there was a cause that would advance the prosecution of the instant case.